

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>Christina D. Roedeshimer,</b>	)	<b>CASE NO. 1:23 CV 1085</b>
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	<b>JUDGE PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN</b>
	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Commissioner of Social Security,</b>	)	
	)	<b><u>Memorandum of Opinion and Order</u></b>
	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	

**INTRODUCTION**

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Magistrate Judge Darrell A. Clay (Doc. 15), recommending that the Commissioner’s final decision be AFFIRMED. No objections have been filed. For the reasons that follow, the R&R is ACCEPTED. The decision of the Commissioner is AFFIRMED.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

When objections are made to a Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the case *de novo*. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3) provides that: “The district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” As stated in the Advisory Committee Notes, “When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the

recommendation.” In *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985), the Court held that “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate judge’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.”

**DECISION**

This Court, having reviewed the R&R and finding no clear error, hereby ACCEPTS the Magistrate Judge’s R&R. In accordance with that recommendation, the Court hereby AFFIRMS the decision of the Commissioner for the reasons stated by the Magistrate Judge in the R&R, which is incorporated herein by reference.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4/23/24

/s/ Patricia A. Gaughan

PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN  
United States District Judge